

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 3, 19 - 25, 27 - 30, 38, 45 and 46 remain active in this application. Claims 10 - 18, 33 - 37 and 39 - 44 have previously been canceled. Cancellation of claims 4 - 9, 26, 31 and 32 has additionally been requested above. No new matter has been introduced into the application. The indication of Allowability of claims 1 - 3, 19 - 25, 27 - 30, 38, 45 and 46 is noted with appreciation.

In the Advisory Action mailed January 27, 2205, the Examiner maintained the rejection of claims 4 - 9, 26, 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. again, this ground of rejection is respectfully traversed and is not acquiesced in for the reasons of record. It is abundantly evident that the inventors are in possession of the invention when an enabling disclosure can be made and the Examiner has not questioned the enablement of the practice of the invention. It is also abundantly clear and beyond question that the enabling description of a monolithic embodiment of the invention and a description of the equivalent circuit provides ample enablement for the practice of the invention using discrete components. It is not necessary for the specification to contain a complete and fully detailed description of every embodiment and variation thereof including all possible combinations of features thereof in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, but only to provide enablement of the *practice* of the claimed invention together with (or without concealment of) a preferred embodiment of the invention. Therefore, it is again respectfully submitted that this ground of rejection is without substantive basis and is in error.

Nevertheless, since the Examiner has allowed the claims from which the claims in question depend and these allowed claims are not limited to the specific

subject matter but comprehend the subject matter of the claims in question, Applicants have requested cancellation of claims 4 - 9, 26, 31 and 32, above, to expedite the prosecution of the application. It is also respectfully submitted that since all of the remaining claims have been indicated as being allowable, it is respectfully submitted that the cancellation of these rejected claims places the application in *prima facie* condition for allowance. In this regard, it is also respectfully submitted that the cancellation of these claims renders the Examiner's question in regard to the illustration of Figure 18 moot, as well.

Accordingly, since the above amendment clearly places the application in *prima facie* condition for allowance, it is respectfully submitted that entry of the amendment filed December 28, 2004, and the above amendment is well-justified, particularly in view of the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action of January 27, 2005, and such entry and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

A petition for a one-month extension of time has been made above. If any further extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041.

Respectfully submitted,



Marshall M. Curtis
Reg. No. 33,138

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P. C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, Virginia 20190

(703) 787-9400
Customer Number: 30743